

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 213 326

HE 014 784

TITLE Part-Time Faculty in Colleges and Universities. 1981
Current Issues in Higher Education, No. 4.

INSTITUTION American Association for Higher Education,
Washington, D.C.

PUB DATE 81

NOTE 21p.; Selected papers presented at the Annual
National Conference of the American Association for
Higher Education (Washington, DC, March 1981).

AVAILABLE FROM American Association for Higher Education, One Dupont
Circle, Suite 600, Washington, DC 20036 (\$3.50 plus
postage and handling).

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.

DESCRIPTORS Collective Bargaining; *College Faculty; Community
Colleges; Consultation Programs; Court Litigation;
*Faculty College Relationship; *Faculty Development;
Grievance Procedures; Higher Education; Inservice
Teacher Education; *Legal Problems; *Part Time
Faculty; Professional Associations; Retrenchment;
*Teacher Characteristics; Teacher Effectiveness;
Teacher Employment Benefits; Teacher Orientation;
Tenure

IDENTIFIERS Vista College CA; West Virginia

ABSTRACT

Characteristics of part-time faculty, the legal position of part-time faculty, faculty development for part-timers, and other concerns are addressed in four papers. Thomas A. Emmet mentions the activities of some higher education associations with regard to the part-time employment issue and identifies 10 considerations for practices for these staff. In "Who Are the Part-Timers and What are Colleges Doing for Them?" Howard P. Tuckman and Barbara H. Tuckman deal with the background and taxonomy of part-time employment in higher education. Seven categories of part-timers are identified: hopeful full-timers, full-mooners, homeworkers, students, part-mooners, semi-retired, and part-unknowners. Fringe benefit programs, grievance procedures, retrenchment and changing educational demands, and carrying forward the college's mission are also addressed. In "The Legal Position of Part-Time Faculty," John Andes considers legal issues pertaining to part-time faculty, including questions of liberty and property rights, contract requirements, collective bargaining rights, and tenure. Findings from a survey of West Virginia institutions and court cases are also considered. In "Faculty Development for Part-Timers," Richard Bagwell and Ione Eliooff discuss how Vista College, a part of the Peralta Community College district in California, handled orientation and inservice development for part-timers. After a survey of 408 current or recent Vista faculty, a faculty development program was designed to increase both teaching effectiveness and a sense of affiliation of the college's faculty. Components included an orientation meeting, seminars, teaching and learning consultants, and a faculty journal. (SW)

Part-Time Faculty In Colleges and Universities

Overview 1
Thomas A. Emmet

**Who Are the Part-Timers and
What Are Colleges Doing for Them? 4**
Howard P. Tuckman and Barbara H. Tuckman

The Legal Position of Part-Time Faculty 8
John Andes

Faculty Development For Part-Timers 13
Richard Bagwell and Ione Elioff

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY
HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

NAHE

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE
position or policy.



AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

One Dupont Circle, Suite 780
Washington, D.C. 20036

The American Association for Higher Education is a national organization open to all individuals concerned with the value and effectiveness of higher education. Each year AAHE's National Conference on Higher Education brings together some 2,000 educational administrators, faculty, students, representatives of education agencies and associations, government and foundation officials, and others to discuss common concerns, disseminate effective educational practices, and focus on the future of higher education. The theme of the 1981 Conference was "Promising Frontiers: Five Partnerships for Higher Education."

Current Issues in Higher Education is based on topics addressed at the Conference. Selected papers presented at the Conference are included in the five monographs that make up the 1981 series. Several additional papers were prepared especially for publication here.

AAHE members receive *Current Issues in Higher Education* as part of their membership fee. Copies of individual issues of the series also are available, as listed on the inside back cover.

AAHE Board of Directors, 1980-81

Chair

Martha E. Church
Hood College

Vice Chair

David G. Brown
Miami University

Past Chair

Martin A. Kramer
Berkeley, California

Marie E. Childers
Illinois Board of Higher Education

R. Morton Darrow
Prudential Insurance Company of America

Carolyn K. Davis
University of Michigan

Paul A. Elsner
Maricopa County Community College District

Carol Frances
American Council on Education

O.B. Hardison, Jr.
Folger Shakespeare Library

Sister Colette Mahoney, RSHM
Marymount Manhattan College

Anne-Marie McCartan
California Community Colleges

Wilbert J. McKeachie
University of Michigan

Robert F. Sexton
Kentucky Council on Higher Education

Donald M. Stewart
Spelman College

Elizabeth Wells
Cincinnati, Ohio

Willard Wirtz
National Institute for Work and Learning

Overview

Thomas A. Emmet

The issue of part-time faculty has taken on greater importance in recent years, as demonstrated by the activities of higher education associations.

Through these efforts and the work of researchers, information and guidance is available to institutions for developing policies on part-timers.

The employment relations of part-time faculty or staff members in colleges and universities promises to be a major issue throughout the decade of the '80s. The literature on this subject currently is rather scarce and fugitive. But in the past few years the issue has attracted some substantive comments that may lead to further research and to the creation of institutional policies designed with the development of the faculty member in mind.

There are two basic realities about part-time faculty and staff: First, all part-timers are not alike in their motivations for employment, their work roles, or their career directions. Second, the reasons for employing part-timers differ among institutions and part-time employment in academe differs from that in other settings.

The pioneer research into these employment realities has produced two efforts to classify part-time faculty based on their motivations for working part-time. The schemes have been labeled, by David Figuli in his academic law lectures on part-timers, the "Tobias Trilogy" and the "Tuckman Taxonomy."

Sheila Tobias, while associate provost of Wesleyan University, developed a model to deal in particular with women teaching part-time at Wesleyan so the university might recognize and reward the different types of part-time services and so that the women might obtain better employment conditions. She classified her part-timers as Moonlighters, Sunlighters, and Twilighters.

Howard Tuckman, working under a grant from the Ford Foundation to the American Association of University Professors, refined the Tobias Trilogy and identified seven categories as a taxonomy for studying part-time employment motivations and conditions (Tuckman 1978c). With his wife, Barbara, and a few others of us working in the field, he is now refining these seven groups: Hopeful Full-Timers, Full-Mooners, Homeworkers, Students, Part-Mooners, Semi-Retired, and Part-Unknowners.

The work of David Leslie and some of his graduate students, while he was an assistant professor of higher educa-

tion at the University of Virginia, produced some basic groundwork and distinctions on legal contractual and collective bargaining issues dealing with part-timers. He has recently been joined by an academic lawyer in practice, David Figuli, legal counsel of the Montana Board of Regents, who is researching case law and precedent in part-time employment relations in higher education institutions.

Higher education associations also have become active in the part-time employment issue. The earliest interest was expressed among the membership of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, which has had numerous panels at annual meetings and has sponsored a few conferences on the subject. They were followed closely by the American Association of University Professors, which as a follow-up to the Tuckman research developed a working draft on part-time faculty through a subcommittee of its Committee A on Academic Freedom and Tenure. This document relies heavily on the Tuckman research and raises a number of institutional and public policy issues. The AAUP approach shows a rather sophisticated understanding of the problem from the views of part-time faculty, full-time faculty, and institutional administrators.

The American Federation of Teachers Advisory Commission on Higher Education issued in April 1979 a *Statement on Part-Time Faculty Employment*. This statement is less well researched and not as in-depth an analysis as the AAUP study, but raises many of the same public policy and institutional issues with a strong union bias. In particular, its perspective is that of the part-time faculty member.

With all this activity starting to jell by late 1979, the American Council on Education, the American Association of University Professors, and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges held two leadership seminars, under the direction of the author and W. Todd Furniss of

Thomas A. Emmet is special assistant to the president and professor of education at Regis College and is director of leadership seminars for the American Council on Education.

ACE, that included sessions on "The Part-Time Faculty Member—Use or Abuse?" ACE is now conducting several seminars on the topic as part of its Leadership Seminar Series. The Council also has commissioned a group of researchers and policy developers in the field to prepare a monograph for its Fair Practices Series as a guide to institutional policies and practices.

This monograph by AAHE represents one aspect of the Association's continuing interest in the academic workplace and in academic career alternatives. Three areas of concern are outlined in the papers that follow: Howard and Barbara Tuckman deal with the background and taxonomy of part-time employment in higher education. John Andes discusses statistical findings and legal issues; and Richard Bagwell and Ione Elioff discuss how one community college has handled orientation and in-service development for part-timers. The reading list at the end of this article includes a number of other useful references.

Although much work remains to be done in this area, based on the research and programs already undertaken we can draw some conclusions at least about how the issue of part-time faculty employment should be approached.

Ten considerations for policy making

The issue of part-time faculty does engender some serious philosophical, ethical, and professional debate. Higher education has the opportunity to resolve these problems in a humane and professional manner. Following are ten areas to which institutions should devote attention in the formulation of policies on part-time faculty employment.

1. The institution should examine: its current use of part-time faculty in terms of the motivations of part-timers; current employment relationships of part-timers (definition of part-time faculty, duties and rights, institutional information provided, etc.); the relationship of the use of part-timers to institutional mission and programs; the integration of part-time faculty with full-time faculty (committees, faculty development opportunities, academic governance rights). This examination takes time but is a vital starting place.

2. Based upon this study, the institution should develop a rationale for the use of part-time faculty that takes into account the needs of the part-timers, full-timers, and students, as well as issues of quality control, institutional mission and vitality, and administrative and financial ability to manage such a rationale.

3. A creative quality-control policy must operate in full concert with institutional mission, needs, and affirmative action to search, screen, appoint, and contract part-timers.

4. The institution must create a sound, easily managed evaluation system for quality control of instruction by part-

time faculty that is not a burden either to the faculty or to the administrators who must handle it.

5. The institution needs an orientation, in-service, and faculty development program that takes into account the different motivations of part-time faculty and is tailored to their needs. It should include opportunity for voluntary activities with full-time faculty; mentor or "buddy" systems seem to be helpful with part-time faculty and should be considered.

6. Part-timers should receive a faculty handbook, either a special one or sections in the general faculty handbook containing information for part-time faculty who may not be fully familiar with generally accepted academic practices. Further, a specific contractual section is necessary dealing with a definition of part-time ranks, titles, faculty status, promotions (if any), tenure (if any), types of contracts, severance, non-renewal, layoff, and dismissal.

7. The institution should review the academic and other support services available to part-time faculty and students after regular working hours.

8. The institution should develop methods whereby traditional academic freedom, due process, and canons of professional ethics of the profession and specific disciplines are extended to and understood by part-time faculty and staff.

9. The institution should develop an equitable compensation package, including differential salary and fringe benefit arrangements, which takes into consideration the motivational and career needs of part-time personnel as well as their contractual assignments.

10. Institutions that have part-time personnel in any numbers should take every opportunity to "show them off" as part of their community resource base. Full-time faculty and part-time faculty need to be further involved in a variety of joint efforts that can enhance institutional vitality, program quality, student interest, faculty development, and career change.

Addressing these ten areas will, I believe, go a long way to blunt future charges of exploitation, abuse, lack of quality and such, as institutions use an increasing number of part-time faculty for an increasing number of faculty career and institutional program reasons.

The topic of part-time faculty is quite complex, and to date the responses have been a bit too simplistic. This discussion is aimed at getting the needed dialogue, research, and policy formulation further along the road.

Bibliography

Figuli, David. "Legal Concerns of Academic Administrators Outline: Part-Time Faculty Issues of a Legal Nature." Washington, D.C.:

- Leadership Seminars, American Council on Education, 1981.
- Furniss, Todd W. *Reshaping Faculty Careers*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1981.
- Head, Ronald B. "Legal Issues Concerning Part-Time Faculty Employment." Ph.D. thesis, University of Virginia, 1978.
- Head, Ronald B. and Leslie, David W. "Bargaining Unit Status of Part-Time Faculty." *Journal of Law and Education* 8 (July 1979): 361-78.
- Leslie, David W., ed. *Employing Part-Time Faculty*. New Directions for Institutional Research, No. 18. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978.
- Leslie, David W. and Head, Ronald B. "Part-Time Faculty Rights." *Educational Record* 60 (Winter 1979): 46-67.
- Leslie, David W. and Ikenberry, D. Jane. "Collective Bargaining and Part-Time Faculty: Contract Content." *The Journal of the College and University Personnel Association* 3(Fall 1979): 18-26.
- Leslie, David; Kellams, S.; and Gunne, M. *Part-Time Faculty in American Higher Education*. New York: Praeger, forthcoming.
- Parsons, M. H., ed. *Using Part-Time Faculty Effectively*. New Directions for Community Colleges, No. 30. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.
- "The Status of Part-Time Faculty." *Academe* 67 (February-March 1981): 29-39.
- Tuckman, Barbara and Tuckman, Howard. "Part-Timers, Sex Discrimination, and Career Choice at Two-Year Institutions." *Academe* 66 (March 1980): 71-76.
- Tuckman, Howard. "Who is Part-Time in Academe?" *AAUP Bulletin*. Washington, D.C.: American Association of University Professors. December 1978.
- Tuckman, Howard and Caldwell, Jaime. "The Reward Structure for Part-Timers in Academe." *Journal of Higher Education* 50 (November-December 1979): 745-60.
- Tuckman, Howard and Vogler, William. "The Part in Part-Time Wages." *AAUP Bulletin*. Washington, D.C.: American Association of University Professors, May 1978, pp. 70-77.
- Tuckman, Howard; Caldwell, Jaime; and Vogler, William. "Part-Timers and the Academic Labor Market of the Eighties." *The American Sociologist* 13 (November 1978): 184-95.

Who Are the Part-Timers and What Are Colleges Doing for Them?

Howard P. Tuckman and Barbara H. Tuckman

People take on part-time employment for a variety of reasons, and colleges and universities need to analyze the situation of their part-timers when determining policies for compensation, fringe benefits, and grievances.

Part-timers and other temporary faculty loom larger on the campus green in the '80s than they did in the '60s. These faculty provide the institutional flexibility to meet unexpected shifts in enrollment demands, reduce personnel costs, and permit the offering of specialized courses. They also provide a source of fresh ideas in an environment where financial stringency and declining enrollments limit the number of new persons entering academe.

Many institutions view part-timers as temporaries, and as such, have not subjected them to systematic and well-articulated policies. The question of how to treat part-timers is often left to chairpersons, division heads, or deans. Selection criteria for these faculty are largely ad hoc and few part-timers play a role in the governance process. Grievance rights are limited and many part-timers are hired on the basis of one-semester contracts or short letters of agreement. Fewer than 20 percent have any measure of job security and few have access to the full-time jobs that open in their departments. When this group was small the absence of well articulated policies made little difference; at its current size, the potential for conflict has increased substantially.

Within this large group of part-timers are individuals with a wide variety of reasons for choosing part-time rather than full-time employment. One sampling yielded the following seven categories of part-time faculty:

- Full-Mooners—persons who, in addition to their part-time job, held a full-time job of 35 or more hours per week for 18 or more weeks—27.6 percent of the sample.
- Students—persons employed in departments other than the one in which they are registered to receive a degree and who are called part-timers by the institutions that hire them—21.2 percent.
- Hopeful Full-Timers—persons whose primary reason for becoming part-time is that they could not find a full-time position—16.6 percent.
- Part-Mooners—persons holding two or more part-time

jobs of less than 35 hours per week for more than one week—13.6 percent.

- Homeworkers—persons whose primary reason for becoming part-time is to take care of a relative or child at home—6.4 percent.
- Semi-Retired—persons whose primary reason for becoming part-time is that they are semi-retired—2.8 percent.
- Part-Unknowners—persons whose reasons for becoming part-time do not fall into any of the above categories—11.8 percent.

How should part-timers be compensated?

How part-timers should be compensated is an important question since many institutions hire part-timers to reduce instructional costs. At present, most part-timers and other temporary faculty are paid either on the basis of hours or courses taught. How much they are paid may depend on the rank they hold, yet more than two-thirds of all part-timers are instructors. Those holding a higher rank tend to receive a few hundred dollars more per course than those of lower rank but, in most instances, advanced credentials and higher productivity do not create large salary or wage differentials among part-timers.

Because part-time salaries are not determined by the same factors as full-timers', it is difficult to argue that the

Howard P. Tuckman is distinguished professor of economics and Barbara H. Tuckman is assistant professor of economics at the Fogelman College of Business and Economics, Memphis State University. Howard Tuckman presented a version of this paper to the 1981 National Conference on Higher Education, March 4-6, in Washington, D.C.

salaries of part-timers are proportional to those of full-timers. A major problem in achieving proportionality involves the determination of a comparable load for the two types of faculty. A part-timer whose sole job is to teach and who has no committee responsibilities, no advising, and no other academic functions should command a different salary than a full-timer who teaches the same number of course hours but who also performs other duties. Some institutions make no allowance for this and base their compensation on class hours taught. Others simply assume that a part-timer does not engage in non-teaching activities. A consequence is that a part-timer who performs non-teaching activities receives no compensation for this work. Over time, many part-timers become disenchanted with their institutions for failure to provide adequate rewards for the work they perform.

A particularly difficult situation is created by the Hopeful Full-Timers. In the recent job crunch these persons have taken one or more part-time jobs, primarily because full-time jobs are not available. Hopeful Full-Timers are found most frequently in fields where full-time employment is scarce, many hold PhDs, and many perform the work of a full-timer, either at the same institution or at several. Despite the long hours they put in, the members of this group seldom are rewarded proportionally to full-timers and they rarely have access to available full-time jobs. Furthermore, compared to other part-time faculty their earnings are relatively low and their academic part-time earnings constitute a large part of their total income. These are the marginal members of academe and their ranks appear to be growing. As their numbers increase, so will the pressure to respond to their needs.

A related problem is that many institutions do not provide a raise to part-timers when full-timers' salaries increase. Once part-timers negotiate a salary it can remain the same for several years. At least two consequences result. First, persons who rely on a part-time job as a primary source of earnings fall behind the rest of the labor market. This can give rise to frustration, discontent, and turnover among part-timers. Second, the growing disparity between part- and full-time salaries creates an incentive for institutions to hire more part-timers. It also creates an incentive to reduce the number of full-time openings. Moreover, because part-timers are low paid, and because they are substitutes for full-timers, their large supply and ready availability contribute to the slow growth in the salaries of full-timers.

As full-timers come to recognize these phenomena they may join with part-timers to achieve a more realistic standard of proportionality. Alternatively, they may put pressure on institutions to reduce the number of part-timers hired. In either event, both intra-faculty and faculty-administration conflict are likely to increase. Such conflict can be lessened if faculty senates and university administrators work to arrive at a consensus as to the rights of the two groups prior to the onset of conflict. But a quick resolution of these issues is unlikely.

Fringe benefit programs

Most academic institutions provide limited fringe benefits to part-timers. For some, the attraction is that even if part-timers are paid proportionately, they still cost less than full-timers because they need not be paid fringe benefits. A frequent justification for this practice is that part-timers do not need fringe benefits because they hold other jobs that provide coverage.

Little basis exists for this assertion in reality. According to a 1978 study, fewer than 30 percent of all part-timers are employed in a full-time job elsewhere. About 14 percent are employed in another part-time job subject to the same limited coverage and another 21 percent are students with little coverage. In short, few part-timers can count on fringe-benefit coverage if they do not get this from their academic employer.

How comprehensive is the coverage that part-timers receive? The table below, based on a recent study, indicates that the coverage is uneven at best. A large number of institutions provide at least some coverage for retirement

Percentage of institutions providing no coverage of this type to part-time faculty, 1978-79

	Ret.	Health	Life	ST/Sick	LT
Full-time					
Ph.D.	1	1	5	—	4
Master's	1	1	12	—	12
Bachelor's	3	4	12	—	17
Part-time/more than half-time					
Ph.D.	2	16	38	38	36
Master's	4	12	61	60	69
Bachelor's	2	15	73	67	77
Part-time/less than half-time					
Ph.D.	—	41	90	74	87
Master's	9	37	93	81	94
Bachelor's	6	46	94	83	95

Notes: ret=retirement benefits; health=health insurance; life=life insurance; ST/sick=short-term disability and sick pay plans; LT=long-term disability income protection.

Source: Maryse Eymonerie, *The Availability of Fringe Benefits in Colleges and Universities* (Washington, D.C.: American Association of University Professors, 1980), pp. 11-15.

purposes. But life and health insurance benefits and sick pay vary substantially by type of employment and type of institution. Relatively few institutions provide the basic forms of health insurance found in most industries. As a result, most

part-timers are vulnerable if they become sick or disabled.

Some institutions argue that it is difficult to arrange for proportional fringes. How, for example, can an academic institution arrange to pay for partial health coverage? Other institutions have resolved this issue with their insurance companies, allowing employees to pay a portion of the costs themselves, or providing an amount to part-timers that represents the prorated share of what the institution would pay for a full-timer. At present, many institutions are unconcerned about the fringes they offer part-timers, mainly because the latter are a divided and largely invisible group. As this group grows in size, the pressure to provide more explicit fringe payments is likely to increase. Once the desire is there, the problem of proportional payment can be resolved fairly easily.

Grievance procedures

Because a significant number of part-timers believe their academic jobs to be of secondary interest, the proportion of grievances from this group is likely to be less than from full-timers. On the other hand, the terms for part-time employment are not well-defined and this can increase grievances. Grievances from part-timers are most likely to occur over short notice on teaching assignments; priorities as to times, days, and courses; and treatment in relation to full-timers. The same flexibilities that make the hiring of part-timers desirable from an institutional point of view create insecurities from the part-timer's perspective. Because of their isolated situation, part-timers are likely to feel somewhat removed from their employing institutions and more subject to arbitrary decisions.

For these reasons, it is essential that academic institutions establish a meaningful grievance procedure for part-timers. Such procedures must specify whether part-timers will sit on the grievance committee or its substitute, the times that part-timers are eligible to teach, how they should be evaluated and compensated, and the nature of both institution and faculty rights. Among the questions that must be dealt with are:

1. What types of courses will part-timers be hired for and what rights, if any, will they have to other courses in their employing department or division?

2. How much freedom will part-timers have to choose their own books, make up their own exams, and shape the content of their courses?

3. What criteria govern which part-timers will be asked to teach a course and what criteria, if any, will be used to create permanent attachments to their employing institutions?

4. How will part-timers be evaluated and how will their evaluations be rendered comparable to full-timers'?

5. Will part-timers have any representation within their departments or at a higher level of the institution when policies affecting their work environment are formulated?

6. What kind of recourse do part-timers have if unsatisfied with the initial salary or if there is no salary increment after teaching several courses for the department or division?

7. Under what conditions will a raise be forthcoming?

8. How can a part-timer make known an interest in a full-time position and under what circumstances does the employer have an obligation to give a part-timer serious consideration?

9. What kind of protection can part-timers be offered for academic freedom or to insure that a contract will not be cancelled because of political rather than academic considerations?

Retrenchment and the changing demands on academic institutions

No single issue is as likely to engender as much conflict between part- and full-timers as retrenchment. At present, some academic contracts call for the layoff of part-timers before full-timers when retrenchment occurs. Others emphasize the elimination of a whole unit rather than of select individuals. In some institutions where retrenchment has occurred, firings of full-time faculty in some fields have been followed by gradual rehiring at the part-time level. Some institutions have argued that their survival depends on cost reduction and that part-timers play an important role in this regard. Still others take the view that since full-timers are their lifeblood these faculty should be the last to lose their jobs.

Thus far, there is little evidence as to which side is correct, although both positions are likely to be tested in court in the next few years. Selective use of part-timers can preserve the breadth of course offerings that characterize modern academic institutions. But if part-timers dominate an institution, its character is likely to change.

There is no single arrangement that is likely to fit all academic institutions. Instead, the faculty mix will be determined by a set of compromises based on the needs of institutions and faculty. Such compromises are not easy but if agreement is not reached prior to retrenchment, it will be much more difficult to achieve after.

Part-timers can play an important role in meeting the demands placed on academic institutions by the changing composition of enrollment and by the evolving needs of our economic and social systems. Among the evolving changes are the growth in the number of adult learners, the rising competition from non-academic institutions, the shifting enrollments across fields, and the growth in student enrollments sensitive to the business cycle. Under these circumstances academic institutions will try to avoid, and faculty will try to encourage, long-term commitments. The interplay between the two interests will have a major effect on the nature of higher education in the '80s.

Maintaining research vitality as faculty age

Much has been written in recent years about the aging of the professoriate and its implications for the flow of new ideas. Especially in the sciences, a real concern exists that entry

into academe has been seriously impeded for young scholars and that this may slow the rate of technological progress in the next few decades. Proposals to correct this problem take many forms including the early retirement of faculty, creation of government-sponsored research positions, and mid-career recycling of faculty.

To date, part-time faculty have not been regarded as a serious source of enrichment to the academic sector. In part, this is because most part-timers are employed as instructors with limited regard for their credentials. It may also reflect the low regard in which some part-timers are held. As the number of total academic positions shrinks, the relative importance of part-timers grows. If academic institutions use their new part-time positions to upgrade the quality of their offerings and to provide a source of new ideas, as is currently done in medical schools, and if some part-time positions are created for researchers, part-time positions can be used to partially offset the effects of reduced mobility for the profession.

For such a program to be successful, institutions must commit themselves to more formal hiring and evaluation criteria for part-timers. A stock of positions will also have to be created for part-time researchers. They also must provide more effective evaluation and feedback procedures for their part-time faculty and find ways to integrate them into their employing departments.

Maintaining institutional integrity with a transient faculty

A serious problem facing institutions that have opted to hire a majority of part-timers is how to maintain institutional integrity and identity. The problem is less serious when part-timers carry more than a half-time load than when they teach only one course but it exists in either case. At least three issues can be identified: (1) how to insure the integrity of a given program offering, (2) how to preserve an interest in student needs, and (3) how to maintain faculty interest in academic governance.

When a majority of the members of a department are part-timers, the chairperson or division leader must deal with a set of coordination problems that range from insuring the integrity of coverage in the various courses to developing external sources to monitor what is happening in the classroom. Many of the communication channels that exist in a full-time department function less effectively with part-timers. Strong and creative leadership can keep these problems to a minimum. But someone must assume the responsibility for insuring that a departmental perspective is preserved and that feedback is obtained. In the absence of adequate coordination, the part-timer remains an outsider to the institution.

A similar argument can be made for insuring that the needs of students are met. A faculty member who is hired solely to teach class cannot show the same interest in students as one who is constantly on the premises. Institutional policies need to recognize this and respond. In

many two-year institutions, for example, a single adviser is designated for the students of part-timers. This serves not only to insure that students are well advised but also provides feedback on how part-timers are teaching.

Part-timers in the year 2000

As the pursestrings continue to tighten for many institutions, made worse by raging inflation and declining federal funding, more institutions will turn to part-timers to meet their needs. If the quality of education is to be preserved, and the rights of part-timers protected, the issues raised here will require the serious attention of the educational establishment. The jury remains out on the question of whether part-timers augment the quality of higher education or whether they debase it. Whether they will become a larger force in the next two decades will depend, in large part, on the policies that institutions of higher education adopt in the next few years. Part-timers are neither good nor bad for academe in their own right. Instead, they are a diverse group with many different motives and goals. Whether we learn to employ them in a constructive manner will surely be one of the fascinating questions of the '80s.

References

- National Research Council. *Research Excellence Through the Year 2000*. Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Sciences, 1979.
- Tuckman, Howard. "Part-time Faculty: Some Suggestions of Policy." *Challenge*, January/February 1981, pp. 8-10.
- . "Who is Part-time in Academe?" *AAUP Bulletin*. Washington, D.C.: American Association of University Professors. December 1978, pp. 305-15.
- Tuckman, Howard; Caldwell, Jaime; and Vogler, William. "Part-timers and the Academic Labor Market of the Eighties." *The American Sociologist* 13 (November 1978): 184-95.
- Tuckman, Howard, and Vogler, William. "The Part in Part-time Wages." *AAUP Bulletin*. Washington, D.C.: American Association of University Professors. May 1978, pp. 70-77.

The Legal Position of Part-Time Faculty

John Andes

As the numbers of part-time faculty increase, the legal problems of this type of employment become more apparent. Since state and institutional policies often do not adequately cover the contingencies, decisions of the National Labor Relations Board and the courts are filling the void.

Part-time faculty have a long and valued tradition in American higher education. From the full-time clergy in the colonial colleges and full-time doctors who founded the early medical schools, to the teaching administrators and the shared or split positions in the 1980s, part-time faculty have been an integral part of the instructional program of colleges and universities.

The economic pressures and enrollment trends of recent years have prompted institutions to turn increasingly to part-timers to fill staffing needs. Some of the reasons for this growing use of part-time faculty can be summarized under several headings:

- **Financial:** The institution incurs less expense in hiring a part-timer because it does not have to pay the same rate per credit hour or provide the same fringe benefit package as for full-time faculty.
- **Flexibility:** Part-timers give the institution the ability to adjust to the rise and fall in student demand for courses; their availability allows the college to add or drop sections or courses. This freedom from long-term employment commitments may be critical in a time of retrenchment.
- **Curriculum competency:** Part-timers often can meet special needs in the curriculum that may not require the services of a full-time faculty member. Part-timers can draw on professional experience from their employment outside higher education.
- **College/community relations:** The use of part-time faculty from the community can offer positive public relations benefits.

How many part-timers, and where?

It is difficult to obtain accurate data on the number and percentage of part-time faculty in U.S. colleges and universities, although several educational and government agencies have produced national and trend studies. The data from the National Center for Education Statistics, presented in Table 1,

provides the longest trend line but tends to underestimate the number of part-time faculty. The table shows a decline in the percentage of part-timers from 1960 to 1970 and then a reversal with an increased percentage through 1978.

Since 1970 the number of part-time faculty has more than doubled. In community colleges more than 55 percent of the faculty are part-timers. In four-year colleges approximately 25 percent are part-time, and in universities the figure is under 20 percent. Significant variations in the use of part-time faculty also occur by discipline and among individual institutions. A survey of West Virginia institutions illustrates these general trends. In 1974 part-timers were 24.17 percent of the faculty; by 1979 that figure had risen to 32.52 percent. Table 2 provides a breakdown by institution that demonstrates the wide variation in the use of part-timers.

The study also found that West Virginia part-time faculty, as compared to full-time faculty, are more likely to (1) have less experience in higher education and at the institution; (2) be younger; (3) have only a master's degree; and (4) be employed as a lecturer or instructor. No significant differences were found on the basis of sex or race. The West Virginia findings are consistent with the national demographic data. In general, part-timers have fewer academic credentials (40 percent M.A. or less), longer practical/professional experience, less academic experience, and less theory in their content field.

Compensation and categories of part-timers

Although compensation for part-time faculty varies widely by type of institution and by discipline, there are two major systems: pro rata, in which the basic costs are equal to the costs

John Andes is professor of higher education administration of West Virginia University. He presented a version of this paper to the 1981 National Conference on Higher Education, March 4-6, in Washington, D.C.

Table 1: Full-time and part-time resident instructional staff in institutions of higher education, instructor and above

Year	Part-Time		Full-Time		Total
	No.*	Percent	No.*	Percent	
1960	82	34.75%	154	65.32%	236
1961	86	34.68	162	65.32	248
1962	92	34.72	173	65.28	265
1963	97	34.52	184	65.48	281
1964	95	30.94	212	69.07	307
1965	92	27.06	248	72.94	340
1966	84	23.20	278	76.80	362
1967	91	23.33	299	76.67	390
1968	96	22.43	332	77.57	428
1969	100	22.22	350	77.78	450
1970	104	21.94	369	77.85	474
1971	113	22.97	379	77.03	492
1972	120	24.00	380	76.00	500
1973	138	26.19	389	73.81	527
1974	161	28.40	406	71.60	567
1975	188	29.94	440	70.06	628
1976	199	31.44	434	68.56	633
1977	208	31.66	449	68.34	657
1978	215	32.23	452	67.77	667

*Number in thousands

Source: W. Vance Grant and C. George Lind, eds., *Digest of Educational Statistics* (Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics, 1979).

of a full-time faculty member doing the same work; and per course, credit hour, contact hour, or work hour, in which the cost may range from one-fourth to nine-tenths of the cost of a full-time faculty member doing the same work.

These two types of compensation—pro rata and per course or credit—and the duration of the part-timer's employment provide a means of classifying part-time faculty, as illustrated in Table 3.

Table 3: Types of part-time faculty

	Continuing (more than three consecu- tive terms)	Occasional (less than three consecutive terms)
Pro rata (paid a percentage of full-timer's salary)	1	2
Per course/credit (paid a fixed fee based on courses or hours taught)	3	4

Type 1, continuing pro rata part-timers, are paid a percentage of the full-time faculty rate and teach consecutively over an extended period. Type 3 part-timers also are employed over an extended period but are paid on a per-course or per-credit-hour basis. Type 2 and 4 part-timers are truly temporary employees because they do not have an extended period of consecutive employment. The duration of

Table 2: West Virginia faculty by type, by institution, 1979-80

Institution	Type	Total Faculty	Full-Time Faculty	Part-Time Faculty	Percent Part-Time
Marshall	Graduate	514	361	153	29.77
West Virginia University	Graduate	1123	953	170	15.14
West Virginia College of Graduate Studies	Graduate	152	55	97	63.82
Bluefield	4-year	182	82	100	54.95
Concord	4-year	113	86	27	23.89
Fairmont	4-year	288	180	108	37.50
Glenville	4-year	109	82	27	24.77
Shepherd	4-year	144	103	41	28.47
West Liberty	4-year	158	136	22	13.92
West Virginia Institute	4-year	190	146	44	23.16
West Virginia State	4-year	212	136	76	35.85
Parkersburg	2-year	172	84	88	51.56
Southern	2-year	141	59	82	58.16
West Virginia Northern	2-year	245	66	179	73.06
Potomac State	2-year	70	44	26	37.14
Total		3813	2573	1240	32.52

Source: John O. Andes, *Report of State Wide Study of Part Time Faculty in West Virginia* (Charleston: West Virginia Board of Regents, in press, 1981).

a part-timer's employment is among the factors that can be important in the determination of a part-timer's legal status.

Legal considerations

Part-time faculty are not mentioned in most state statutes, board policies, or institutional policies relating to tenure, promotion, or grievance procedures. Thus, the decisions of the National Labor Relations Board and state and federal courts are filling the void, as part-time faculty members and faculty organizations seek to assert the rights of part-time faculty.

The cases of *Roth v. Board of Regents* and *Perry v. Sinderman* outlined basic rights of "liberty" and "property" as they pertain to faculty employment. In both cases the faculty member's contract was not renewed. In *Roth*, the court held that simple nonrenewal of his contract did not entitle the faculty member to a hearing on the matter. The nonrenewal was not based on any charge against the individual nor did it hinder his future employment opportunities.

The State, in declining to rehire the respondent, did not make any charge against him that might seriously damage his standing and associations in his community. It did not base the nonrenewal of this contract on a charge, for example, that he had been guilty of dishonesty, or immorality. . . . Similarly, there is no suggestion that the State, in declining to re-employ the respondent, imposed on him a stigma or other disability that foreclosed his freedom to take advantage of other employment opportunities.

The court also found that the conditions of the faculty member's employment did not give him a "property interest" in the position.

To have a property interest in a benefit, a person clearly must have more than an abstract need or desire for it. He must have more than a unilateral expectation of it. He must, instead, have a legitimate claim of entitlement to it. It is a purpose of the ancient institution of property to protect those claims upon which people rely in their daily lives, reliance that must not be arbitrarily undermined. It is a purpose of the constitutional right to a hearing to provide an opportunity for a person to vindicate those claims. . . . the respondent's "property" interest in employment at the Wisconsin State University-Oshkosh was created and defined by the terms of his appointment. Those terms secured his interest in employment up to June 30, 1969. But the important fact in this case is that they specifically provided that the respondent's employment was to terminate on June 30. They did not provide for contract renewal absent "sufficient cause." Indeed, they made no provision for renewal whatsoever.

Thus the terms of the respondent's appointment

secured absolutely no interest in re-employment for the next year. They supported absolutely no possible claim of entitlement to re-employment. Nor, significantly, was there any state statute or University rule to policy that secured his interest in re-employment or that created any legitimate claim to it. In these circumstances, the respondent surely had a property interest sufficient to require the University authorities to give him a hearing when they declined to renew his contract of employment.

Perry v. Sinderman also set down some guidelines on property rights in faculty employment. Here, the court held that a faculty member who had been employed by an institution for a number of years might be able to show that the "rules and understandings" of his employment could entitle him to keep his position unless the employer showed "sufficient cause" for dismissal.

. . . The respondent must be given an opportunity to prove the legitimacy of his claim of such entitlement in light of "the policies and practices of the institution." Proof of such a property interest would not, of course, entitle him to reinstatement. But such proof would obligate college officials to grant a hearing at his request, where he could be informed of the grounds for his nonretention and challenge their sufficiency.

The logic of these two cases could be used by a part-time faculty member to show a liberty interest or a property interest protected by the U.S. Constitution that could require procedural due process for non-renewal cases of part-time faculty who have been employed continuously over a period of time.

The faculty member also has some recognized property interest during the time of the signed valid contract. The U.S. Supreme Court in the *Roth* case said: "A nontenured teacher . . . is protected to some extent during his one-year term. Rules promulgated by the Board of Regents provide that a nontenured teacher 'dismissed' before the end of the year may have some opportunity for review of the dismissal." This property right may be lessened through stipulations in the contract that state that no contract shall exist if sufficient numbers do not enroll to hold the class.

There appears to be firm legal ground for institutions to treat full-time and part-time faculty differently. *McGowan v. Maryland* provides a clear rationale for public institutions. The court notes that under the 14th Amendment, the states have discretion in enacting laws that affect various groups differently: "The constitutional safeguard is offended only if the classification rests on grounds wholly irrelevant to the achievement of the state's objectives."

For private institutions the rulings of the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) provide guidance, although they were developed for collective bargaining situations. In 1971, the NLRB included part-time faculty members in the same

unit, absent agreement of the parties to exclude them. In 1973, the NLRB changed its position in the New York University case and said:

Part-time faculty do not share a community of interest with full-time faculty, and therefore, should not be included in the same bargaining unit. We shall exclude all adjunct professors and part-time faculty members who are not employed in "tenure track" position. No mutuality of interest exists between part-time and full-time faculty at NYU because of differences with respect to (1) compensation, (2) participation in University governance, (3) eligibility for tenure, and (4) working conditions.

The decision overruled *University of New Haven* and similar cases to the extent inconsistent with this decision. This decision was followed in the Kendall College case where the NLRB ruled that the appropriate collective bargaining unit consisted of the full-time faculty and those part-time faculty employed on the basis of pro-rated full-time contracts, and excluded per-course part-time faculty. Pro-rated part-time faculty were paid salaries reflecting their training and experience, were required to serve on the Faculty Senate and on its committees, and were entitled to most of the same fringe benefits as full-timers. The NLRB considers each case on its merits and has even included administrators who teach part-time in the faculty bargaining unit.

Three-fourths of the collective bargaining contracts explicitly either include or exclude part-timers. Most contracts (almost two-thirds) do not include them in the bargaining unit. Where they are included their inclusion is based on teaching load (percent of full-time or number of courses, credits, or contact hours) and continuous service. In most of these contracts their rights are significantly less than those of full-time faculty with regard to due process, tenure, evaluation, seniority, retrenchment, compensation, fringe benefits, and participation in governance. A few institutions have separate contracts and bargaining units for part-time faculty.

Several cases in the California courts have set forth rulings on the employment of part-time faculty in that state. In *Vittal v. Long Beach Unified School District*, a faculty member had been employed on hourly-rate contracts for 12 years. In addition to teaching she had counseled students, attended staff meetings, and served on various committees. The court ruled that she had "served in excess of 75 percent of the school days for three consecutive years and thus [was] entitled to . . . classification as a permanent full-time teacher."

In *Balen v. Peralta Junior College District*, an instructor was employed on annual contracts continuously for four and a half years. He received sick-leave benefits and participated in the retirement plan. The court ruled that since the school officials had expressed no dissatisfaction with his teaching ability, Balen's "continuity of service" gave him a reasonable expectation of employment in accordance with the state's classification plan. It determined that he had met "the

statutory prerequisites for probationary employment," and by being re-employed for the fourth year he had received permanent status, under the state statute.

In *California Teachers Association v. Santa Monica Community College District*, the court upheld the college's faculty classification system and the distinctions made between full- and part-time employees.

Court cases in other states provide other legal precedents related to part-time faculty. The case of *Board of Trustees of the State College of Maryland v. Sherman* found that "where state college tenure regulation applied only to full-time teaching and/or faculty research positions, a person did not enter the tenure track when first employed for part-time teaching and part-time student counseling."

A Washington court in *McLachlan v. Tacoma Community College District No. 22* noted that substantial differences existed between the duties of a part-time faculty member and those of a full-timer. Thus, the question of whether a part-timer carried a full-time equivalent teaching load was not relevant, since that individual was not contractually obligated to perform the same duties as a full-time instructor.

In a Missouri case, a faculty member sought to rely on an oral contract. The court ruled, based on a state statute, that part-time faculty must have written contracts (*Neal v. Junior College District of East Central Missouri*).

Conclusion

It is clear from current trends that part-time faculty will continue to be an integral part of American higher education. However, the situation of these employees poses special legal problems—questions of liberty and property rights, of contract requirements, collective bargaining rights, and tenure. In private institutions, written board policies constitute the primary legal guidelines for dealing with part-time faculty. Public institutions must look first to state statutes and then to board policy for guidance. Contracts for part-time faculty need to be written clearly and specifically to meet legal and institutional requirements; institutions must be especially careful to distinguish among probationary, tenured, and temporary faculty and to recognize that liberty and property rights vary as they pertain to each type of employment.

More importantly, colleges and universities should develop an institutional awareness of their use of part-time faculty—the effect on the institution and on the individuals employed on this basis.

References

- Andes, John O. *Report of State Wide Study of Part Time Faculty in West Virginia*. Charleston: West Virginia Board of Regents, 1981.
- Balen v. Peralta J.C. Dist.*, 114 Cal Rptr 589 (1974).
- Board of Trustees of the State College of Maryland v. Sherman*, 373 A 2d 626 (MD 1977).
- California Teachers v. Santa Monica Community College District*, 78 Cal. App. 362 (1978).

- Christeson v. Northwest Alabama State Junior College*, 271 SO 2d 420 (Alabama 1979).
- Grant, W. Vance and Lind, C. George, eds. *Digest of Educational Statistics*. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics, 1979.
- Head, Ronald B. and Leslie, David W. "Bargaining Unit Status of Part-Time Faculty." *Journal of Law and Education* 8 (July 1979): 361-78.
- Kendall College*, 228 NLRB No. 126 (1977).
- Kendall College v. NLRB*, 570 F 2d 216 (Illinois 1978).
- Leslie, David W., ed. *Employing Part-Time Faculty*. New Directions for Institutional Research, No. 18. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978.
- Leslie, David W. and Head, Ronald B. "Part Time Faculty Rights." *Educational Record* 80 (Winter 1979): 46-67.
- Leslie, David W. and Ikenberry, D. Jane. "Collective Bargaining and Part-Time Faculty: Contract Content." *The Journal of the College and University Personnel Association* 3 (Fall 1979): 18-26.
- McGowan v. Maryland*, 386 US 420 (1977).
- McLachlan v. Tacoma CC Distr.*, 541 P 2d 1010 (Wash, 1975).
- Neal v. J.C. District of East Central Missouri*, 550 SW 2d 580 (1977).
- New York University*, 205 NLRB No. 76, p. 4 (1973).
- Peralta Fed. of Teach. v. Peralta Community College District*, 138 Cal Rptr 144 (1977).
- Perry v. Sinderman*, 408 US 564 (1972).
- "Report of the NEA Committee on Substitute, Part-Time and Paraprofessional Personnel." Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1976.
- Roth v. Board of Regents*, 408 US 564 (1972).
- Sewell, Donald H.; Brydon, Charles W.; and Plosser, William. "Report on a State Wide Survey About Part-Time Faculty in California Community Colleges." Sacramento: California Community and Junior College Association, 1976.
- Vital v. Long Beach U. Sch. Dist.*, 87 Cal Rptr 319 (1970).

Faculty Development for Part-Timers

Richard Bagwell and Ione Elioff

When an institution operates with only part-time faculty, it has to create programs for their orientation and development that may suggest approaches other institutions with fewer part-timers can adapt.

When an institution depends almost totally on part-time faculty, as Vista College does, the challenge in designing a faculty development program is clearly to address both the issues common to all postsecondary faculty, and the specific needs of a group that is in no sense "adjunct," but rather is the very backbone of the instructional program.

Vista is part of the Peralta Community College district, which serves a 64-square mile urban area, including Berkeley and Oakland. Vista was established in 1974 with a charge to reach out to area residents who have not been traditional consumers of postsecondary education, and counter the time and place barriers to their learning. The college has grown rapidly, from 900 part-time students per semester in 1976-77 to 15,500 part-time students in spring of 1981. Clearly the college has found and met major areas of educational need.

From the beginning, almost all faculty employed by Vista have been part-timers. In the spring of 1981 there were 357 part-time faculty, and two full-time faculty.

Part-timers allow the college maximum flexibility in designing course offerings to respond to the diverse educational needs of adults, and the changing social and economic characteristics of this community. Their use also offers financial and administrative advantages to the district. More importantly, the college can make good use of the professional expertise of many individuals actively working in occupations paralleling instructional areas. As working professionals they can be expected to be abreast of the state of the art in their fields, and be well-versed in the realities of actual employment. They are a direct link to the community's economic and social structures.

Vista's Instructional program

Vista offers transfer, occupational, and continuing education in four broad areas: business, energy and environmental technology, human services, and general studies. Besides

A.A. degrees it offers occupational certificates in several specialized areas.

Many courses are planned to meet the educational needs of learners in the midst of career or life transitions. About half the instructional program is designed—often through direct request from business and industry—to meet inservice and career development needs in specific occupational areas. The other half of the instructional program provides general continuing education for lifelong learning, with emphasis on courses for special populations such as senior citizens and the disabled.

Two further characteristics of Vista proceed from these circumstances and from the college's mission and objectives. They aren't unique, but while relatively unusual now, very probably they will become more common in higher education. They both present additional challenges to teaching.

First, Vista is a non-campus college, one of nine in the United States, employing part-time faculty for almost all teaching. It has classroom space for microprocessors, word processors, and other business equipment. But with very few other exceptions, courses are taught in rent-free community locations, including private businesses, public institutions, senior centers, churches, and libraries—some 188 sites at present. The college indeed is in the community.

Second, the students are an extremely diverse group, few of whom fit the image of the "traditional" college student. The average age is 41. Many are fitting their studies into lives already well-filled with work and family obligations. They enroll with very specific educational aims, whether continuing education for personal enrichment or career development.

Richard Bagwell is staff assistant and Ione Elioff is director of the Faculty Development for Part-timers project at Vista College in Berkeley. They prepared this paper for publication in Current Issues in Higher Education.

They come and go with a rapidity that sometimes disconcerts educators accustomed to traditional academia.

The Vista faculty who teach adult learners under these circumstances may be broadly characterized as follows: They are part-time, hence their teaching isn't and can't be expected to be the center of their professional lives. Most (75 percent) work full- or part-time elsewhere, usually in the field in which they teach, and are knowledgeable practitioners whose work experiences enrich their classroom activities.

In common with most full-time postsecondary faculty they have little if any specific training as *teachers*. Moreover, they are denied two advantages that help set new full-timers in traditional colleges on the path to becoming effective teachers: the intense "sink or swim" survival stage during which they can make developing teaching skills their major professional focus, and the informal peer-group support and resources of more experienced colleagues with whom they have daily contact.

... it is perfectly possible for a Vista instructor not to set foot in Vista's offices, nor meet face to face with either an administrator or a colleague for a considerable time.

One of the usual problems associated with part-time faculty at all institutions, a feeling of isolation and lack of involvement with the college as a whole, is exacerbated by the non-campus operation. Since a great deal of communication takes place by telephone and mail, it is perfectly possible for a Vista instructor not to set foot in Vista's offices, nor meet face to face with either an administrator or a colleague for a considerable time. Additionally, between expansion and a high (20 percent) turnover rate, Vista typically has hired 60 to 100 new faculty each year.

A faculty such as this obviously can benefit greatly from a comprehensive development program to help them realize their maximum potential in the classroom.

Faculty survey

Proceeding on the principles that assessment should form the basis of a successful program, and that faculty involvement in planning is essential for acceptance, in the spring of 1979 an instructional coordinator surveyed 408 current or recent Vista faculty (Elioff 1980). The 12-page, 32-item instrument assessed individual backgrounds and experiences, feelings and observations about teaching in this kind of college, and perceptions about adult students. It also asked for input on faculty support and development activities, and invited the

respondents to rank in importance various inservice topics. With substantial encouragement, 299 completed the questionnaire.

The results were consistent with the general profile of the Vista faculty described above. The survey also indicated that they were very supportive of the college's overall goals and mission. Personal enjoyment and intellectual stimulation far surpassed money and status as the major reasons for teaching. Generalizations are always tricky with a diverse group, however. Vista does have a contingent of "freeway warriors": talented liberal arts teachers with one or more advanced degrees who have not found a full-time post in today's shrinking market and who eke out a living by part-timing at several of the many postsecondary institutions in the greater Bay area.

The survey respondents liked what they were doing and were interested in ways of doing it better. They were more supportive of inservice activities than their counterparts at comparable schools. A gratifying two-thirds of them felt it was reasonable to ask them to spend several hours per semester—with no compensation—on inservice activities. They were especially interested in student retention, adult learning theory, and instructional techniques. The preferred inservice strategies were, in order, a newsletter about teaching and learning, short seminars on specific instructional topics, and occasional large-group workshops focusing on a broad problem area or discussion topic.

Using the survey data and information on faculty development activities at three other non-campus community colleges, (Coastline, in California; Pioneer, in Missouri; and Rio Salado, in Arizona) Vista staff designed a comprehensive development program with the overall objectives of increasing both the teaching effectiveness and the sense of affiliation of the college's faculty. This program formed the basis of a successful proposal for a three-year project supported by the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, beginning with the 1980-81 academic year.

Program components and activities

Part of the program built upon and expanded existing faculty development at Vista:

A two-hour *orientation meeting* sets the stage for working at the college, explains the characteristics and operational features of the college, and prepares new faculty to function in their multiple roles of learning diagnostician, instructional planner, teacher, counselor, registrar, and public relations person. With so many new faculty coming aboard each semester, the orientation process is especially important. We're presently developing a slide/tape program to enrich the presentation and serve as an alternative for instructors who miss the orientation meeting.

In 1981 we upgraded the half-day workshop held yearly in the spring to a *one-day seminar*, feeling that this better

reflected the professional status of the faculty. Semantically, this recognizes participants as contributors as well as learners. More than 100 faculty members attended, meeting together and participating in small workshops, such as "Artists Working with Special Populations," and "The Adult Learner Mix."

Mini-seminars on various topics are held periodically throughout the year. Most recently about 25 faculty attended a three-evening series on adult learning theory.

A teaching/learning resource library of selected books, papers, periodicals, and videotapes is available for faculty use at the college's administrative offices.

The program also developed two new components: teaching and learning consultants and a faculty journal.

Teaching and learning consultants

Peer "teaching and learning consultants" ("TLC's") function as a professional resource to their colleagues, providing technical assistance, problem solving, and whatever other services will help them to be more efficient in their teaching role. They are compensated from the project budget.

The six TLC's are Vista part-time instructors selected on the basis of teaching excellence, expertise in a specific teaching and learning area (for example, curriculum development, group process, communication techniques), and experience in counseling and consulting. Collectively, they represent a very broad range of disciplines and professional skills. The TLC's confer periodically as a group with the project staff, sometimes with outside consultants. They receive resource material and some special training sessions and workshops.

Peer "teaching and learning consultants" . . . function as a professional resource to their colleagues, providing technical assistance, problem solving, and . . . other services . . .

Use of TLC services is voluntary and confidential. We have announced their availability at seminars and workshops and in the faculty journal, providing details of their professional background and experience. Interested faculty members can ask for a referral or contact a TLC directly. TLC's keep records of the purposes and outcomes of individual consultancies, but all documentation is anonymous.

In its first six months this part of the program has been used only modestly, but as more faculty become aware of the possibilities, we expect more consultancies. Some of the services TLC's have provided include:

- Help in clarifying and implementing class goals, developing appropriate alternative instructional methods,

and examining the class group process.

- Direct feedback based on class observation and evaluation of handout materials; counseling on the instructor's professional/career growth; and development of new course proposals for Vista.
- Help in developing course content and lesson plans for a professional practitioner teaching for the first time.

In the coming academic year the TLC's will organize and conduct short (two- or three-hour) sessions for small groups of faculty to address specific problems, interests, and disciplines. They will also do networking among faculty to build linkages for instructional improvement and personal support.

TIE-LINE: a faculty journal

Vista's school-to-faculty communication is difficult. It is impossible to assemble a major portion of our instructors even briefly. In our survey the faculty chose a periodical as the best form of communication, and we determined to make a monthly publication a major component of the project, with considerable budget and staff time devoted to it. It has several functions:

- To announce and report on faculty development activities.
- To help provide a sense of faculty identity and unity by publicizing professional activities and accomplishments of individual faculty, and carrying interviews and profiles.
- To provide teaching and learning material of real substance on the special characteristics of adult learners and teaching in a community outreach institution.

Because this last category has long-term rather than ephemeral value, we felt justified in defining the publication as a "journal" rather than a newsletter. We selected the name TIE-LINE to underscore its faculty-connecting function, and for the connotation of being an information source. Recognizing that it would have to compete for attention with the blizzard of paper that accumulates on all faculty desks, we adopted a large-format design, aimed at conveying an image that is professional, up-to-date, and accessible.

TIE-LINE is also distributed to the faculty and staff of the other colleges in the Peralta district. A mail-in survey card included in the first issue gave readers a chance to specify topics they would like to see covered.

Initial outcomes

While the long-term objectives of our faculty development program are to increase the teaching effectiveness and sense of affiliation of the college's faculty, we did not expect to see dramatic results after a few months. A formal evaluation of program components is not yet complete; however, informal

comments and general reactions from faculty have been almost totally positive. Overall, faculty appreciate our efforts to centralize and expand inservice activities that support them in their classroom roles. As we intended, they see the program as developmental and supportive, not as a way to remediate teaching deficiencies.

Informal faculty comments indicate that the monthly journal is both useful and stimulating. We are trying to make it a forum for on-going professional exchanges, and individual instructors have contributed several articles. Vista faculty obviously feel no pressure to publish, so developing a dialogue or exchange feeling for the journal will take time. But we are hopeful that this aspect will grow stronger.

The workshops and seminars have been very well received. It is worth noting that the aspect of these group affairs is also important. Our part-timers don't see much of each other, and they obviously enjoy each other's company when they do. This is not surprising—collectively they're a very interesting and dynamic group. We take care to build adequate social time into activities. It certainly promotes identification with fellow faculty, and the shop talk is very useful as well.

One of the TLC's has been leading a drop-in faculty support group during the spring semester. This has attracted only a few so far, but the sessions have been successful as "support" and an opportunity for interchange.

Response to and use of the TLC's has been slow but positive. Some consultancies have been very short, but others have extended into several meetings with faculty to observe classes, plan instructional materials, or work on complex teaching and learning problems. Next year the TLC's will continue to work with individual instructors, but we also plan that they will encourage the formation of informal support groups of five to ten faculty to meet occasionally to discuss professional and personal concerns.

Generally, our initial efforts have produced some positive results in terms of morale and information-sharing. In a very real sense, Vista's faculty is its own best resource. Many of our teachers teach very effectively indeed. Much of the project might well be conceptualized as exploring ways of tapping into the faculty's collective knowledge and experience, and sharing it with all. This is certainly the root of the peer consulting TLC program.

We tried a faculty-survey technique that worked well. We inserted a questionnaire in one issue of TIE-LINE, asking what methods teachers used to assess their classes for the purposes of individualizing instruction. Seventy-one responded, providing a body of useful material. However, there is surely a point of diminishing return in repeated fill-in surveys and questionnaires.

Problems

Several problems that we anticipated surfaced during our first year of operation: lack of faculty time and the distractions of

non-instructional issues. The greatest problem has been time—for the instructors to find space in their hectic personal schedules to devote uncompensated time to development in an area that, for the overwhelming majority, is not the center of their professional activities. This is not apathy, just the constraints of budgeting a finite amount of energy.

There is no magic solution. We try to make the material good, to make it as efficiently and conveniently accessible as possible, to make sure faculty know it is there, and then trust to their own zeal and commitment to good teaching.

Problems related to district economic conditions and general part-time teaching issues undoubtedly affected our inservice efforts to an extent that is impossible to quantify. As with all California public institutions, the Peralta District is facing funding cuts, and part-timers are particularly vulnerable. After months of uncomfortable apprehension, the local impact of state and federal budgetary decisions is still uncertain. This economic issue, combined with the continuing issue of the appropriate role of part-time faculty, has produced morale problems—especially for those part-time faculty who depend on teaching for a major portion of their income.

One problem that we anticipated did not in fact appear: the potential conflict of faculty inservice and evaluation procedures. We have been able to clearly separate the two kinds of activities. Participation in development program activities is voluntary (and in the case of TLC, confidential), and according to individual faculty preference. Our efforts to remain detached from evaluation activities have been reinforced by the district's adoption of a fairly conventional, inflexible evaluation procedure that is the responsibility of instructional administrators who are not directly connected with inservice activities. This separation is intentional and essential to the long-range success of our efforts.

Vista's Faculty Development for Part-timers project has several advantages and positive circumstances that stand as recommendations for colleges instituting similar programs. (Also see Barbara Stordahl's "Faculty Development: A Survey of Literature of the '70s," which includes 16 postulates for a successful program.) First, the administration, especially the president, strongly supports the program—not only verbally, but financially, by providing an even match for federal funds within a tightly stretched budget, and by agreeing to support program activities after external funding disappears. Second, the project is central to the college's overall instructional program. Responsibility and authority for it are very clearly defined. The primary developer of the project is now assigned full-time to direct it, while remaining influential in instructional planning and decision making. As coordinator of instruction in human services she had extensive contact with a sizable portion of the faculty for a number of years.

The project also has a full-time staff assistant who edits TIE-LINE, coordinates faculty-TLC contacts, and plans various group and individual inservice activities.

As noted previously, the faculty is strongly committed to their teaching and was involved in the early stages of planning. We have tried hard to make it *their* program, one that answers *their* expressed needs and interests, while respecting and using the considerable contribution they have to make. Their acceptance and supportive attitude have been quite good. At this point the major challenge seems to be to get them to make optimum use of project activities.

Goals for the second year of the project include continuation and improvement of all components with emphasis on linking TLC's with small groups of faculty experiencing similar teaching problems, collecting and sharing information about successful teaching strategies for diverse groups of adult learners.

We hope that we have instituted a major program that will continue in years to come, for cumulative effects are needed to achieve the overall goal: that of helping these talented part-time faculty realize their maximum effectiveness in teaching a diverse student population.

References

- Bender, L. W., Hammonds, J. O. "Adjunct Faculty: Forgotten and Neglected." *Community and Junior College Journal*, October 1972.
- Eloff, Ione. *A Study of Part-time Faculty and Recommendations for Faculty Development at Vista College—A Noncampus Community College*. Doctoral dissertation, Nova University, 1980. ED 188 725.
- Leslie, David W. "Current Perspectives on Part-time Faculty." AAHE-ERIC Research Currents. *AAHE Bulletin*. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Higher Education, November 1978.
- Lombardi, John. *Noncampus Colleges: New Governance Patterns for Outreach Programs*. Topical Paper No. 60. Los Angeles: University of California, ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, March 1977.
- Stordahl, Barbara. "Faculty Development: A Survey of the Literature of the '70s." AAHE-ERIC/Higher Education Research Currents. *AAHE Bulletin*. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, March 1981.
- Williams, F. N. "The Neglected Teachers: The Part-time Faculty." *Adult Leadership*, September 1972.

Current Issues in Higher Education

Copies of the 1980 and 1981 *Current Issues in Higher Education* are available individually or in sets, at the prices shown below. Bulk discounts are available. To prices listed add 15% postage/handling charge. All orders under \$15 must be prepaid. Make checks payable to AAHE and mail to AAHE Publications, One Dupont Circle, Suite 780, Washington, DC 20036; 202/293-6440.

1981 Series—Complete set \$15.

1. **High School/College Partnerships (\$3.50)** • High School/College Partnerships That Work—Ernest L. Boyer • High School/College Cooperative Programs—Michael O'Keefe • Humanities for the High Schools—Gale K. Crouse • Building a High School-to-College English Curriculum: The Queens English Project—Janet R. Brown • Quality and Equality in the High School Curriculum: A College Board Study—George H. Hanford.

2. **Creating an Integrated Curriculum—The 'Higher' in Higher Education (\$3.50)** • What Is 'Higher' About Higher Education?—Harlan Cleveland • Curricular Integration: Mortar for the Ivory Tower—Mary Jim Josephs • Integrative General Education: The Saint Joseph's Model—John Nichols • An Integrative Program for Building Skills: The City and The Self—Susan Gurewitsch

3. **Partnerships with Business and the Professions (\$3.50)** • New Frontiers for Higher Education: Business and the Professions—K. Patricia Cross • A Role for Colleges in Corporate Training and Development—Ernest A. Lynton • Partnerships in Continuing Education for Professionals—Philip A. Nowlen and Milton R. Stern

4. **Part-Time Faculty in Colleges and Universities (\$3.50)** • Overview—Thomas A. Emmet • Who Are the Part-Timers and What Are Colleges Doing for Them?—Howard P. Tuckman and Barbara H. Tuckman • The Legal Position of Part-Timers—John Andes • Faculty Development For Part-Timers—Richard Bagwell and Ione Eloff

5. **New Technologies for Higher Education (\$3.50)** • Overview—Raymond J. Lewis, Jr. • What Makes A Telecourse?—Rodger A. Pool • Curriculum Issues in Telecommunications—Adele F. Seeff • Administration Issues in Telecommunications—Marlowe Froke • Adapting to the Computer Revolution—John H. Strange

1980 Series—Complete set \$15

1. **Improving Teaching and Institutional Quality (\$3.50)** • When Does A College Deserve To Be Called "High Quality"?—Alexander W. Astin • Measuring the Quality of Student Effort—C. Robert Pace • Commentary on Pace—Mark Curtis • The Changing Roles and Priorities of Academic Advising—Toni B. Trombley and David Holmes • Teaching Improvement Strategies: How Effective Are They?—Robert J. Menges • Are Instructional Improvement Programs Off-Target?—Robert T. Blackburn, Glen Pellino, Alice Boberg, and Colman O'Connell • What Are the Obstacles to Improving Quality Teaching?—Hans O. Mauksch

2. **Funding Quality Improvement: Lessons from the FIPSE Experience—Charles I. Bunting (\$3.50)** • Commentary on Bunting—Charles Bingman, Sol Pelavin, Kenneth W. Tolo • Proliferation and Agency Effectiveness in Accreditation: An Institutional Bill of Rights—H. R. Kells • Commentary on Kells—Robert L. Ketter, William H. Knisely, Kenneth E. Young (\$3.50)

3. **Differing Perspectives on Declining Faculty Salaries (\$2.50)** • How Well Are Faculty Paid? Implications of the Academic Reward Structure—Kristine E. Dillon and Robert H. Linnell • The Economic Decline of the Professoriate in the 80's: What Happened to Faculty Salaries and What Are the Implications?—Peggy Heim

4. **New Models for General Education (\$2.50)** • General Education for a Contemporary Context—Jerry G. Gaff • Quality and the Campus: The High School/College Connection—Ernest L. Boyer • Curricula: Priorities for the 80's: Beyond Retrenchment—John C. Sawhill

5. **Integrating Adult Development Theory with Higher Education Practice (\$2.50)** • Adult Development: A Workable Vision for Higher Education—Arthur W. Chickering • Faculty and Student Development in the 80's: Renewing the Community of Scholars—L. Lee Knefelkamp

6. **Strategies for Retrenchment: National, State, Institutional (\$3.50)** • Basing Public Policy on Student Achievement: A New Agenda Item—Francis Keppel • Commentary on Keppel—Willard L. Boyd, Alice J. Irby, Elizabeth H. Johnson, Thurston E. Manning • New Roles for the States in Monitoring Higher Education Quality—Carl Kaysen and the Sloan Commission on Government and Higher Education—The Management of Universities of Constant or Decreasing Size—Richard M. Cyert